DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 285 CS 012 451

AUTHOR Lambert, Judy C.; Hood, Joyce
TITLE Listener Feedback to Developing Readers' Miscues.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Reading; Feedback; *Listening Habits; Miscue Analysis; *Oral Reading; Primary Education; Reading Research; Reading Skills; Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Listening Reading Relationship; *Reading Behavior

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the diversity in listener responses to student behaviors during oral reading. Participants were four beginning readers in grades one through three. The adult listeners included the child's classroom teacher, a listener from the home, and a reading teacher and/or one or more reading tutors. The children were videotaped reading a different but comparable book with each listener. Transcripts of 13 sessions, including miscues, corrections, and other responses and interactions were coded and analyzed to determine variation. Results indicated that these young readers faced a lot of variety, and that patterns of reader and listener behaviors seemed interrelated in very complex ways. Listeners seemed to have a preferred response to miscues and differed considerably in the amount of chance they allowed readers to catch and correct their own errors. Listeners also varied greatly in their demand for accuracy when meaning was not distorted by the miscue. Most young readers were allowed to do only very short spurts of reading between listener-interruptions for accuracy. The number and type of interruptions often made it appear reading was not being done for meaning, but rather to decode each word accurately though this tended to vary in relation to relative difficulty of stories for specific readers. (Contains 26 references. Appendixes include reader miscues, a miscue grid, six tables of data, and categories of segments.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 395 285

Running Head: LISTENER FEEDBACK

Listener Feedback to Developing Readers' Miscues

Judy C. Lambert and Joyce Hood

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

College of Education and Human Services
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901

414-424-2478
fax: 414-424-0858
lambert@vaxa.cis.uwosh.edu
boettchj@vaxa.cis.uwosh.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, New York, NY, 4/96.

CS012451

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study investigated the diversity in listener responses to student behaviors during oral reading. Participants were four beginning readers. The adult listeners included the child's classroom teacher, a listener from the home and a reading teacher and/or one or more reading tutors. The children were videotaped reading a different but comparable book with each listener. Transcripts of 13 sessions, including miscues, corrections, and other responses and interactions were coded and data analyzed to determine variation. It was found that these young readers faced a lot of variety, and that patterns of reader and listener behaviors seemed interrelated in very complex ways. Listeners seemed to have a preferred response to miscues and differed considerably in the amount of chance they allowed readers to catch and correct their own errors. Listeners also varied greatly in their demand for accuracy when meaning was not distorted by the miscue. Most young readers in this study were allowed to do only very short spurts of reading between listener-interruptions for accuracy. The number and type of interruptions often made it appear reading was not being done for meaning, but rather to decode each word accurately though this tended to vary in relation to relative difficulty of stories for specific readers.

Listener Feedback to Developing Readers' Miscues

When young children are learning to read, they often read aloud to various adults. These adult listeners may include individuals from the home, classroom teachers, and frequently for children experiencing difficulty, remedial teachers and/or tutors. When these beginning readers read, they make deviations from text. The adult listeners then, as the "teachers," do something they think will help the child develop as a reader. In other words, they respond to the miscue. The way the listener responds sets up an expectancy message for the child as to how to approach the reading task.

A miscue episode is defined as "the sequence of events initiated by an oral reading error." (Chinn, Waggoner, Anderson, Schommer & Wilkinson, 1993, p. 362). This series of events involves first, the reader making a deviation from text, second, the reader reacting in some way to his or her own miscue (including the reader ignoring it or not being given the chance to react) and third, the listener providing feedback in some way (including choosing to ignore the miscue). Besides feedback in such episodes, listeners provide expectancy messages in other types of responses and in extended interactions before, during and after the child reads.

Miscue Research

The conceptual framework and techniques for looking at oral reading performance are provided by Kenneth and Yetta Goodman and Carolyn Burke (Goodman, 1967; K. Goodman & Burke, 1973; Y. Goodman & Burke, 1972). The reader is viewed as constantly sampling information from surrounding cue sources (grapho-phonic, syntactic, and semantic) and using this information to make predictions about upcoming text. Deviations from expected responses or miscues are then viewed as "windows" into the reading process, described by Goodman (1967) as

a "psycholinguistic process" to draw attention to the active contribution of readers in anticipating and constructing language as they decode print. In order to read with comprehension, decoding must be fast--too fast to allow for letter-by-letter sounding. Thus meaning (syntactic and semantic cues) plays a great role in skilled fluent reading (Smith, 1988).

Oral reading miscues. A large body of research on oral reading deals with miscues and their implications about readers' strategies. Typical findings are that poorer readers tend to make a larger proportion of miscues that are graphophonemically similar to the correct text word while better readers tend to make a larger proportion that are semantically acceptable (Wixson, 1979). Good readers use both context and graphic cues while poor readers tend to over-rely on context (Juel, 1991; Stanovich, 1991). Good readers adjust reading strategies to conform to the difficulty of text more than poor readers do (Blaxall & Willows, 1984). The reading strategies of poor readers become more like those of good readers when the poor readers are given less difficult text to read (Hood, 1982). Recent findings in a massive study of second and third graders (Chinn et al., 1993) indicate that the density of hard words on a page is a better predictor of high-meaning change errors than are other measures of story difficulty. The overall approach of the reading program has also been shown to have an effect on the types of errors readers make (Wixson, 1979).

Reader reactions to miscues. Chinn et al. (1993) report the most common student reactions to miscues to be continuations with no correction, hesitations, and self-corrections, with students in lower-achieving reading groups much more likely to hesitate and wait for teacher help. They state, though, that the "most prominent reader reaction was not a reader reaction at all . . ." as teachers gave feedback so quickly the reader had no chance to react (p. 375). This is

consistent with Hoffman and Clement's (1984) findings that low ability readers are most likely to be given no opportunity to correct their own errors. Hoffman, O'Neal, Kastler, Clements, Segel, and Nash (1984) have also found low-skilled readers more likely than high-skilled readers to pause following an error or to have no opportunity to react because of the listener jumping in with immediate feedback.

For errors on which readers had an opportunity to react, Chinn et al. (1993) indicate the most common reaction of both good and poor readers is to ignore the error, and the second most common reaction of both groups is to self-correct. Previous research (Share, 1990) had found good readers to self-correct much less often as texts become more difficult, and poor readers to self-correct much more than usual when reading easy texts.

Feedback Research

When samples of oral reading were obtained for miscue research, students were typically asked to read without any listener intervention (Burke, 1976). In instructional settings, however, there is usually a listener whose response patterns may influence the reader's behavior. Listeners have three basic decisions to make when an oral reading miscue is made. They must decide whether to give feedback, when to give it, and what type to give (Chinn et al., 1993; Hoffman et al., 1984). Feedback can be classified as terminal--providing the correct word, or sustaining--supplying some type of aid to help the reader figure out the word.

Listener responses to miscues. Sustaining feedback has been found by clinical experience (Clay, 1979) and previous research cited by Chinn et al. (1993) to be the type of feedback most likely to help students become better readers. Sustaining feedback acts to build and reinforce decoding strategies. This type of feedback has been found to encourage student

self-monitoring (Chinn et al., 1993) while terminal feedback has been negatively related to students' growth in reading (Hoffman et al., 1984).

Consistently across studies reviewed by Chinn et al. (1993), teachers have been found to give feedback after most errors--often, as previously cited, interrupting readers to give immediate feedback and not allowing for self-corrections. Teachers also provide mostly terminal feedback. Story difficulty is positively related to immediate feedback, with more immediate feedback being given on difficult stories.

Feedback related to miscue type. Some research findings suggest that teachers adapt feedback given to types of errors made. Hoffman et al. (1984) report that type of teacher feedback is clearly related to pupil miscue characteristics. For example, errors which cause a high degree of meaning change are more likely to be responded to and hesitations are positively associated with terminal feedback. When the reader continues reading, ignoring the error, teachers have a tendency not to provide feedback (Chinn et al., 1993). Pflaum, Pascarella, Boskwick, and Auer (1980) conclude that specific pupil oral reading behaviors predict teacher behavior twice as much as pupil status variables such as sex and reading achievement.

While overall it appears that teacher feedback is related to miscue characteristics, Chinn et al. (1993) report that the sustaining feedback provided by teachers in their study was not sensitive to the particular errors made by readers, and that the nature of this feedback tended to be predictable as if governed by each teacher's own preferred script. They state that each teacher in their study used a particular sustaining feedback strategy "so consistently that, instead of calling it a strategy, it might better be called a stereotyped routine" (p. 382). Of the six teachers studied, one displayed across children her preferred pattern 86% of the time, and two others 68% and

66%, respectively. Although within-teacher variability was minimal in the Chinn et al. study, across teachers there was dramatic variation in the amount of sustaining feedback provided.

Feedback during group vs individual instruction. Research on listener responses to miscues is based on the situated action theory--the idea that actions hinge on the dynamic interplay of factors that converge at particular moments (Chinn et al., 1993). This evolving sociocognitive theory views thought and action as dependent on the immediate context of the situation. The situational context of the Chinn et al. research was instruction provided to small groups of children reading stories somewhat more difficult than those usually employed in such studies. According to these researchers' interpretation, this context influenced teachers' thought and action toward behaviors which would allow a lesson to move on as quickly as possible and would ensure that the publicly stated story was reasonably accurate. This supports the conclusion of other researchers that in reading groups, teachers and students adapt to one another "to achieve task completion as efficiently as possible" (Hoffman et al., 1984, p. 381).

Roller (1994) reports an analysis of miscue feedback in one-on-one situations where listeners could respond more specifically to individual needs. Based on observed changes in listener responses as children's reading accuracies improved, she concludes accuracy may be an important factor influencing the interactions. For one of the six children studied, listener talk did shift from a focus on decoding to a focus on meaning as accuracy increased. For the remaining students, the nature of the reading material and the teachers' instructional agendas also strongly influenced the type of feedback provided.

Feedback from parents. Most research on listener feedback has focused on teachers, but some researchers have studied parents as the listeners. In a study of over 50 children, age 5 to 7,

Hannon et al. (1986) conclude that parents listening to a child who hesitates or reads a word incorrectly tend to respond in much the same way as teachers. About fifty percent of the time in their study, both parents and teachers provided terminal feedback by giving children words or phrases. Parents, though, were more inclined to wait for the child to express difficulty whereas teachers initiated help more quickly.

Mudre and McCormick (1989) conclude that, although their review of the literature indicates parents seldom provide feedback effectively without training, their research findings suggest parents can, with specific training and reinforcement, learn and retain the use of beneficial oral reading feedback strategies. Their training program successfully increased parent listeners' use of praise, encouragement of children's self-corrections, and use of context clues. Over the course of the training period, the children showed decreases in error rates and increases in their use of context, independent self-corrections, and correct responses to literal comprehension questions. These effects on children's oral reading behaviors suggest that meaning-focused listener feedback does indeed have a causative positive relationship to reader performance.

Feedback related to ability. Many teachers make systematically different feedback decisions with high and low reading groups (Chinn et al., 1993; Hoffman & Clements, 1984). This is consistent with research which showed that teachers communicate different expectations to students believed to be more or less capable with treatment that tends to induce passivity in low-achieving students (Good & Brophy, 1991). According to Purcell-Gates and Dahl (1991) "Curricula and classroom environments which either state directly or imply that the student must passively wait . . . run the risk of learners taking them at their word . . ." (p. 31).

Although the six teachers Chinn et al. (1993) studied varied dramatically in how much sustaining feedback they provided, good readers were more likely than poor readers to receive the sustaining type of feedback. Teachers were more likely to give immediate feedback to the poor readers for high meaning change errors, whereas the reverse was true for better readers with the immediate feedback more often following low meaning change errors. Apparently teachers expected that better readers would catch their own high-meaning-change errors, and that poor readers would be less sensitive to any degree of meaning change. In earlier research, Allington (1980) had also observed that low-achieving readers were interrupted more, received more coaching to attend to graphemic cues, and were more often interrupted at point of error without opportunity to process following contextual information.

Good (1993) has warned that teachers' treatment of low-achieving students often encourages a passive learning style. In addition, he has found greater variation among teachers in their interactions with low-achievers. He hypothesizes that this is because teachers agree less about how to respond to these students who do not learn as easily. Teachers treat these students "... inconsistently as they try one approach after another in an attempt to find something that works" (p. 8). In contrast, high-achieving students experience more similar patterns of behaviors by and across teachers. With many low achievers having several teachers in addition to the regular classroom teacher, Good contends that "those students who have the least capacity to adapt, may be asked to make the most adjustments ..." (Good, 1993, p. 8).

Problem

This study investigated the variability in miscue feedback that children receiving special help in reading were given by adults who frequently listened to them read. It addressed the

consistency with which the listeners' feedback implied a purpose for the reading session of monitoring skill practice vs sharing a story, encouraged reader dependency vs independence, and emphasized meaning cues vs print cues when coaching miscue correction. It addressed also the nature of the readers' behaviors with these listeners--whether the readers paid relatively greater attention to meaning or to print as cues to self-correction, and whether the readers appeared relatively more self-confident or dependent on their listeners' help.

Method

Participants

Four beginning readers--Ashley, Nicole, John and Johnny--participated in the study. They all were either 7 or 8 years old, in grades 1 through 3, and referred to the University as needing extra help in reading. As the focus was on listener differences more than reader differences, subjects at a comparable level of reading development were chosen. An attempt was made to minimize the range in relative difficulty of material by pre-selecting a set of appropriate books from which each reader could choose what to read. Each child was videotaped reading a different complete book to each of three or four listeners. Someone from the home, the regular classroom teacher, and a special reading teacher and/or one or more tutors were the adult listeners. Adult listeners were told to use whatever procedures they normally followed when reading with the child. Table 1 contains information regarding the four readers and their respective listeners.

Data Collection

A total of 13 oral reading sessions were videotaped and transcribed. The investigators viewed each videotaped session, pausing at each departure from text to transcribe teacher and

student utterances--noting all miscues, all feedback responses, all brief and extended listener-reader interactions, and nonverbal gestures such as pointing to words or the reader hesitating or looking to the listener for help. Several investigators independently viewed the tapes to compare and resolve differences for the purpose of establishing accuracy. Two types of data were then obtained, miscue-related data and session-time data.

Miscue-related data involved the number of miscues, the types of miscues and the reader and listener responses to the miscues. Appendix A contains the instructions established for this process. Appendix B contains the analysis form used. Appendix C contains a table with information about stories read, the miscues per hundred words (PHW) and rates of reading. Four investigators independently analyzed each transcript while viewing the videotape to categorize all miscues and reader and listener responses. Investigators then compared their transcript analyses to identify and resolve disagreements.

Session-time data involved determining the total time devoted to reading and classifying all interaction as either listener-initiated or reader-initiated and as either story-related, miscue-related or other. One of the investigators timed each taped session in three independent viewings, noting the time at the beginning and end of each segment of uninterrupted reading. The durations of each segment of reading and each interruption were determined by resolving minor differences among time scores from the three viewings. Interruptions lasting fewer than three seconds were recorded as one second segments arbitrarily due to unreliability of timing. Each interruption was categorized following instructions presented in Appendix D. The sum of all reading segment times and interruption segment times equaled the total time elapsed between the child's reading of the first and last words of a story, excluding time taken for turning pages.

Data Analyses

The research questions and relevant data computations were as follows

Did use of time imply a view that the purpose of the reading session was to read for meaning or an opportunity to learn reading-related skills?

a) percent of session time spent reading

b) the average length in words of reading uninterrupted by listener

c) the percent of listener-initiated interaction time spent in meaning-related vs miscue-related discussion

Did listener miscue feedback behavior encourage reader independence or dependency?

a) the percent of corrections listener-initiated

b) the percent of listener corrections with wait-time of 3 seconds or more

c) the percent of miscues the listener corrects by providing word (terminal feedback)

d) the percent of miscues the listener indicates to reader a correction is needed for but provides no help

Did listener miscue feedback behavior emphasize meaning cues or print cues?

a) the percent of listener corrections which draw attention to meaning cues

b) the percent of listener corrections which draw attention to print/decoding cues

c) the percent of OK miscues left uncorrected by listener

d) the number of times listener interrupted for miscue correction before end of the sentence

Did reader behavior indicate a focus on meaning or print and a feeling of dependency or independence?

a) the number of reader-initiated interruptions with a meaning focus

b) the percent of miscues for which the reader sought assistance

c) the percent of reader-initiated corrections with rereading of context surrounding the miscue

d) the percent of high meaning-change miscues for which the reader initiated correction

Results and Discussion

Variation in Miscue Feedback

Purpose of the Reading Session

Table 2 contains the percent of session time spent reading, the average length in words of reading uninterrupted by listener-initiated interaction, and the percent of listener-initiated interaction spent in meaning-related versus miscue-related discussion. Throughout the discussion of results, in this and in subsequent sections, the score for a reader/listener pair is identified as high or low relative to the mean and median of scores for all 13 reader/listener pairs.

Percent of session time spent reading. Overall, listeners varied greatly in the percent of session time they allowed a child to spend reading, ranging from 49% to 87%. For three of the four children, the amount of reading time with different listeners varied by more than 25%. For

only one child, John, was the percent of session time spent reading consistently high, averaging 81%.

Listener interruptions. The frequency of interruptions varied from an average of 11 words to an average of 149 words read between interruptions. John experienced the greatest range because one of his TUTORs interrupted much less frequently than any other listener. Excluding his first TUTOR's very deviant pattern of interruptions, the average number of words read between interruptions was 31. Nicole was interrupted most frequently and most consistently by all of her listeners. Overall, she averaged only 18 words read between interruptions. In contrast, Ashley's listeners interrupted with consistently less frequency, averaging an interruption every 53 words. Johnny experienced somewhat more variation among his listeners, reading much fewer than the average number of words between interruptions with his HOME LISTENER and CLASSROOM TEACHER, and much more than the average number of words between interruptions with his TUTOR.

High percents of session time spent reading tended to go with less frequent interruptions, as one would expect. This was not the case, however, for Nicole's HOME LISTENER and TUTOR. They made frequent short interruptions that still resulted in high proportions of time spent reading. In contrast, Ashley's CLASSROOM TEACHER and READING TEACHER made very few interruptions, but these tended to be lengthy, resulting in low percents of reading time.

Meaning-related vs miscue-related interaction. The content of interruptions varied from 0% to 99% of total interaction time spent discussing story meaning as opposed to time spent on coaching or corrections associated with a reader's miscue. Most of the listener-reader

interaction with Ashley was about story meaning, averaging 94%. (Follow-up comments on story content which were contiguous to miscue coaching were included in the meaning-related interaction time.) John experienced the greatest variation among listeners. His first TUTOR's infrequent interruptions resulted in relatively more time spent discussing story meaning--well above the average over all listeners, while John's HOME LISTENER, like Nicole's and Johnny's, spent almost all the interaction time in coaching and correcting miscues. Except for Johnny's TUTOR, whose interactions also focused almost entirely on decoding, the other listeners' interactions focused on meaning about a quarter to a third of the time.

Summary. Each of these young readers faced variation among their listeners, either in the proportion of session time spent reading or in the content of listener-initiated interaction. There were three children whose percent of reading time varied with listeners, but the content of non-reading time did not vary. Ashley's listeners consistently implied by the content of their infrequent interruptions that the purpose of reading together was to share a story, while the content of Nicole's and Johnny's listeners' consistently frequent interruptions implied that their reading together was for practice in decoding. Only one child, John, was consistently allowed to read most of the session time and to read without much interruption. However, John experienced the most variation in how the interaction time was spent; only one of his three listeners' interaction patterns implied the purpose of reading was to share a story.

Encouragement of Independence Vs Dependence

Listeners may interrupt immediately with signaling feedback (i.e. call attention to a reader's miscue but refrain from giving any help). Alternatively, they may give terminal feedback (i.e. provide the word) or sustaining feedback (i.e. provide coaching), or they may refrain from

interrupting (i.e. use wait-time) so the reader can attempt to correct. Table 3 contains the data relating to these feedback options.

Percent of hesitations/listener-use of wait-time. The percent of hesitation miscues ranged from 4% to 56% (see Table 3). Data generally show a high percent of hesitations for Ashley (average 43%), and thus a proportionately high use of wait-time by her listeners, as compared with those of other readers. Nicole's average of hesitation miscues was moderately high (21%), and the boys' averages were relatively low (9% and 10%).

All readers showed some variation in the percent of miscues that were hesitations, thus indicating some variation in their listeners' use of wait-time. However, the relationship of hesitations to wait-time is somewhat ambiguous as an indicator of reader independence vs dependence. A listener who interrupts too soon may well prevent a reader from opportunities to practice independence in decoding, but a listener has no opportunity to use wait-time as evidence for encouragement of reader independence if the reader does not hesitate. A reader who is a risk-taker may use context to generate hypotheses about unknown words in situations where another reader might hesitate and try to decode or just wait for listener help. Such risk-taking behavior suggests reader independence, rather than dependence, yet wait-time for that reader's listener would be relatively low. It is not clear, therefore, whether the generally lower proportions of hesitations, i.e. lower use of wait-time, for John and Johnny and their listeners is due to high risk-taking behavior by these readers or precipitate interruptions by their listeners.

Listener-initiated corrections, excluding hesitations. The percent of listener-initiated corrections of all miscues except hesitations ranged from 11% to 94%. For these miscues the percent of corrections that were listener-initiated was consistently lower for Ashley than for other

readers, averaging 18%. Taken together, the data in Table 3 suggest Ashley's listeners consistently encouraged her independence. They frequently used wait-time, thus giving Ashley opportunities to attempt decoding independently. They seldom initiated corrections, and when they did, they rarely used terminal feedback or signaling. However, Ashley's miscue rate was very low overall--2.84 per hundred words (PHW), and so was the number of hesitations (1.27 PHW), so there were very few miscues for which there was opportunity for listener feedback of any kind. (Ashley's CLASSROOM TEACHER's apparently high percent of terminal feedback was based on only one miscue).

With regard to the other children, the percent of listener-initiated corrections of miscues other than hesitations was consistently high for Nicole and Johnny, but quite variable for John. Looking specifically at the types of listener feedback, there was variability among the listeners for all three readers. Nicole's and Johnny's HOME LISTENERs used high percents of terminal feedback, while their TUTORs used high percents of signaling. John was rarely given terminal feedback by any listener, but just as for Nicole and Johnny, John's listeners varied widely in the percent of signaling given.

Summary. Ashley's listeners were fairly consistent in initiating miscue correction infrequently and in rarely using types of feedback that encourage dependence (but Ashley's low miscue rate may have some bearing on this pattern). In contrast, Nicole's and Johnny's listeners gave feedback which encouraged dependence with some consistency, tending to interrupt frequently with either terminal feedback or signaling. Three of their listeners--Nicole's READING TEACHER and Johnny's HOME LISTENER and CLASSROOM TEACHER--sometimes interrupted before the readers had opportunity to attempt decoding. For those

reader/listener pairs, the percents of hesitations were lower than they might have been because listener wait-time was low.[1] These data thus provide further evidence of these listeners' encouragement of dependency.

John faced more variability than any of the other readers in his listeners' encouragement of independence/dependence. His HOME LISTENER used wait-time somewhat frequently, which may encourage independence, but on all other miscues, the high percent of listener-initiated feedback--usually signaling--encouraged reader dependence. In contrast, John's READING TUTORs used wait-time fairly infrequently, which may encourage dependence, but their low, or infrequent, initiation of corrections on all other miscues encouraged reader independence.

Emphasis on Meaning Vs Print Cues in Miscue Feedback

Table 4 contains the percent of sustaining feedback in which the listener drew attention to meaning cues, based on all meaning change miscues. (Only OK miscues were excluded in this calculation.) Also in Table 4 are the two indices of concern for accuracy--the percent of OK miscues left uncorrected by the listener and the number of times listeners interrupted immediately after a miscue rather than waiting until the end of a sentence, where meaning cues that followed might have helped the reader self-correct.

Sustaining feedback. When listeners provide sustaining feedback they may either draw the reader's attention to meaning or to print as cues to aid correction. Once again, all readers faced some variation in emphasis on meaning in the sustaining feedback they received from listeners, with a variation over all reader/listener pairs that ranged from 0% to 100%. Ashley's

---

[1]If, instead of these precipitate interruptions, the listeners had used wait-time before providing feedback, the percents of hesitations for these reader/listener pairs would have been 33%, 13% and 25%, respectively.

HOME LISTENER and CLASSROOM TEACHER consistently emphasized print rather than meaning cues in all coaching they initiated, whereas her READING TEACHER used meaning cues half of the time. Remember that very few of Ashley's corrections were listener-initiated, however. Given that the sustaining feedback given by her CLASSROOM TEACHER and READING TEACHER were for only 3 and 4 miscues, respectively, the observed difference in use of meaning cues may be spurious.

All other readers had higher miscue rates than Ashley and their listeners used wait time less often and initiated corrections with greater frequency. For these readers, the percent of sustaining feedback that emphasized meaning cues tended to be quite variable. The sustaining feedback received by all three of these readers from their HOME LISTENERs was least likely to emphasize meaning cues. All of Nicole's HOME LISTENER's feedback emphasized print cues instead of meaning, as did the sustaining feedback given by her READING TEACHER and her TUTOR, also, to a lesser extent. In contrast, her CLASSROOM TEACHER's sustaining feedback emphasized meaning cues over half the time. Both of John's TUTORs provided sustaining feedback which emphasized meaning cues almost exclusively, in contrast to his HOME LISTENER, who emphasized print cues. For Johnny's CLASSROOM TEACHER and his TUTOR, sustaining feedback was about equally distributed between meaning and print cues.

OK miscues left uncorrected. OK miscues have been referred to as "good miscues" because they indicate a strong focus on meaning on the part of the reader (Hood, 1978), and for this reason, listeners are often encouraged to leave them uncorrected. Readers may, however, self-correct some OK miscues before a listener can choose whether to initiate a correction or not. Among the OK miscues in this study where readers did not initiate a correction, there was wide

variation in the percent their listeners did not either correct themselves or require the reader to correct. The range was from 7% to 100% across all listeners for all readers. All of Ashley's listeners fairly consistently left OK miscues uncorrected if Ashley had not self corrected them, and to some extent, John's listeners did so, as well. In contrast, only one of Nicole's listeners--her CLASSROOM TEACHER--was likely to leave OK miscues uncorrected. While Johnny's CLASSROOM TEACHER and his TUTOR left most OK miscues uncorrected, Johnny's HOME LISTENER was more likely either to require that Johnny do so or to correct them herself.

Listener-initiated corrections before end of sentence. The opportunities for delaying listener-initiation of correction varied too widely for meaningful comparisons among listeners. Where the opportunity was frequently available, data in Table 4 show that the HOME LISTENERs for Nicole and John, and all of Johnny's listeners tended to interrupt immediately after miscues rather than delay interruptions until the end of the sentence.

Summary. Except for the focus on print in the sustaining feedback of their HOME LISTENERS, Ashley and John experienced a relatively strong focus on meaning in the sustaining feedback they received and in the freedom to leave most OK miscues uncorrected. Johnny's HOME LISTENER showed a strong print focus, but his other listeners were somewhat more variable. Of Nicole's listeners, only her CLASSROOM TEACHER gave sustaining feedback focused on meaning and allowed OK miscues to go uncorrected, while her other listeners focused strongly on the print.

Reader Behavior

The previous discussion focused on variations among listeners in the patterns of miscue feedback and other interactions which they initiated during the session time. The following

paragraphs provide a review of the consistencies or inconsistencies in the messages which each reader may have gleaned from these behaviors. A summary of each reader's behavior follows. Table 5 contains various reader behavior data pertinent to this discussion.

Ashley. Although the percent of reading time varied among Ashley's listeners, all other listener behavior provided a fairly consistent message. She was interrupted very infrequently, and those few interruptions revealed a consistent meaning focus. Her listeners rarely initiated miscue corrections, and allowed most OK miscues to go uncorrected if Ashley had not already initiated a correction.

Ashley's stories were relatively easy for her to read, and therefore she averaged the lowest error rate of any reader. She frequently initiated discussion of story meaning, especially when reading with her READING TEACHER. While reading with both her CLASSROOM TEACHER and READING TEACHER, she initiated corrections for a high percent of meaning-change miscues. When reading with her HOME LISTENER, this percent was about average among reader/listener pairs. With each listener, Ashley occasionally reread the surrounding context when correcting a miscue. In all these ways, Ashley's behavior suggests a strong focus on meaning. She showed independence in self-initiated miscue corrections, but some dependency in the percent of times she looked to her listener--especially her HOME LISTENER--for help. Ashley was the only reader whose HOME LISTENER was her grandmother instead of her mother.

Nicole. Just as with Ashley, the percent of reading time varied among Nicole's listeners. However, all Nicole's listeners initiated a high percent of miscue corrections and used wait-time relatively infrequently. There were variations in the preferred feedback patterns exhibited by each

listener. Nicole's HOME LISTENER spent no session time discussing story meaning and never used meaning cues in the sustaining feedback she gave. She used mostly terminal feedback and rarely delayed feedback until the end of a sentence. Her TUTOR often used signaling without coaching. Her READING TEACHER used sustaining feedback predominantly, usually with a focus on print cues and she almost never left OK miscues uncorrected. In contrast to the other listeners, Nicole's CLASSROOM TEACHER was most likely to use sustaining feedback that drew attention to meaning cues, and almost always left OK miscues uncorrected.

The stories Nicole read were relatively difficult for her, and she averaged the highest error rate of any reader. She initiated one comment on story meaning. With her CLASSROOM TEACHER, she reread the context surrounding a miscue with some frequency. Nicole's percent of correction of meaning-change miscues was average or better with her CLASSROOM TEACHER and her TUTOR. With her TUTOR, her percent of self-initiated corrections was higher than with any of her other listeners. All these behaviors show some attention to story meaning and some independence. Nicole showed some dependency with all her listeners, except her TUTOR, in the percent of time she looked to them for help. Her percent of self-initiated corrections was quite low with her READING TEACHER, and with her HOME LISTENER, self-initiated corrections almost never occurred.

John. With all his listeners, John spent a high percent of session time reading. However, just as with Nicole, there were variations in his listeners' preferred feedback patterns. His HOME LISTENER spent almost no non-reading time in discussing story meaning. She initiated a high percent of miscue corrections, usually with signaling only, and often interrupted immediately after a miscue rather than at the end of the sentence. Although she did leave the

majority of OK miscues uncorrected, in general her feedback emphasized print rather than meaning and tended to encourage dependency. In contrast, both of John's TUTORs used sustaining feedback predominantly and almost always focused on meaning cues. They left most OK miscues uncorrected. One TUTOR seemed especially concerned with encouraging independence, interrupting very rarely, and with comments mostly focusing on story meaning.

John initiated some meaning-focused interaction with his TUTORs, but not with his HOME LISTENER. With his TUTORs, but not with the HOME LISTENER, John also initiated a high percent of corrections of meaning-change miscues. These corrections included rereading of the surrounding context more often than for any other reader. John rarely looked to a listener for help with decoding, only doing so when reading with his HOME LISTENER. In general, John's behavior with his TUTORs showed more of a meaning focus and more independence than with his HOME LISTENER.

Johnny. All of Johnny's listeners used a high percent of non-reading time for coaching decoding. All initiated a high percent of corrections on miscues other than hesitations, and all used wait-time relatively infrequently. Johnny's HOME LISTENER, although using sustaining feedback the majority of the time, usually focused on print cues. She either corrected or required Johnny to correct most of the OK miscues he did not self-correct, and often asked him to reread correctly the sentence in which a miscue occurred. She showed great concern about the right way to help a reader, frequently preceding an instructive comment with, "We're supposed to do it this way."

Johnny's READING TEACHER used mostly signaling and some sustaining feedback which focused about equally on print and meaning cues. His TUTOR interrupted somewhat less

frequently, using signaling without coaching almost exclusively. Both his READING TEACHER and his TUTOR left the majority of OK miscues uncorrected. In general, Johnny's listeners tended to encourage dependency, though his TUTOR somewhat less than the others. His HOME LISTENER showed a strong focus on print, but his other listeners tended more toward a meaning focus.

Johnny never interrupted with a comment on story meaning. He was much less likely than either his listeners or the other readers to initiate correction of meaning-change miscues, rarely reread the context surrounding a miscue while self-correcting, and never looked to the listener for help. Overall he seemed to focus more strongly on decoding than on meaning, and tended toward dependency. Johnny was the only reader who made any negative comments during the reading session. As an example, after one listener interruption, he complained, "You're mixing me up."

Conclusions

Each of the young readers who participated in this study experienced variation in their listeners' feedback and interaction patterns during the time they read together. However, reader and listener behavior patterns and situational contexts are interrelated in very complex ways, making causation difficult to infer.

There are several competing factors which influence miscue feedback patterns. Some of the variation in focus on meaning vs decoding in listener feedback may be related to the relative difficulty of the stories for specific readers, as it seemed to be for Ashley and Nicole. Ashley, whose stories were very easy for her, experienced much less variation in listener behavior than Nicole, who found her stories much more difficult. Some variation in dependency/independency behaviors may be related to the reader's gender. As a possible example, both girls, though they

exhibited the lowest and the highest error rates, occasionally sought help or reassurance in decoding, whereas the boys almost never did. The percent of hesitations (use of wait-time) provides another example of ambiguity in causation. This percent may be reflective of a risk-taking reader who uses context cues to aid correction as John often did, a dependent reader such as Ashley or Nicole, who sometimes paused to wait for listener help, or a listener who interrupts before the reader can either try to decode or consider context clues, as John's HOME LISTENER did.

Some listener behaviors may vary in relation to the listeners' roles, for example, the CLASSROOM TEACHERs' and READING TEACHERs' use of a higher percent of session time for discussing story meaning in comparison to other listeners. Research on miscue feedback in group settings suggests teacher responses are focused on generating a publicly stated story that is reasonably accurate. Perhaps teachers who typically work with groups of children are used to using oral reading as a way to make story content available to all readers. More broadly concerned with a whole class and a whole curriculum, they want to assure that all students participate in discussions which foster literary understanding and appreciation.

HOME LISTENERs in this study seemed for the most part either quite strongly focused on decoding or very hesitant to give any type of sustaining feedback at all. Their feedback and interaction patterns tended to be very different from those of their children's teachers and tutors. To improve consistency of children's reading practice, teachers would do well to model and guide other listeners in feedback patterns that more closely resemble those the children experience in their classrooms.

The feedback and interaction patterns observed in this study showed variations among the READING TEACHERs and among the TUTORs, which suggest that perhaps their professional preparation has been based on different philosophies of instruction. Variations were observed in percent of listener-initiated corrections, percent of OK miscues left uncorrected, use of signaling without coaching, and focus on meaning vs print cues in sustaining feedback.

The ambiguity in causation of miscue feedback behaviors is an important thing to keep in mind. During the past decade, an awareness of markedly different feedback patterns for children in high vs low reading groups fueled a wave of disaffection with ability grouping. The recommended shift to whole class grouping for reading instruction was likely a rather simplistic reaction to this very complex issue. Although ability grouping may be questionable for many valid reasons, the complexities in causation of feedback patterns suggest that simply abolishing grouping may change listener feedback very little if at all.

Oral reading is extremely common in elementary classrooms. It occurs as part of an instructional interaction between reader and listener. Studying behaviors across the several listeners who interact with specific children may illuminate the consistencies and inconsistencies in the expectations imparted as to what the process of reading involves. The findings in this study illustrate the types of conflicting information readers may receive if they typically read with several individuals during the course of a day or week. Readers who need extra practice in order to improve in reading may be especially vulnerable to mixed messages such as this study has revealed.

References

Allington, R. L. (1977). If they don't read much, how they ever gonna get good? Journal of Reading, 21, 57-61.

Blaxall, J. & Willows, D. E. (1984). Reading ability and text difficulty as influences on second graders' oral reading errors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 330-341.

Burke, C. L. (1976). Reading miscue research: A theoretical position. In P.D. Allen & D.J. Watson, (Eds.), Findings of research in miscue analysis: Classroom implications. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills: National council of Teachers of English.

Chinn, C. A., Waggoner, M. A., Anderson, R. C., Schommer, M., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (1993). Situated actions during reading lessons: A microanalysis of oral reading error episodes. American Educational Research Journal, 30(2), 361-392.

Clay, M. M. (1979). Reading: The patterning of complex behavior. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann.

Good, T. L. (1993). New direction in research on teacher and student expectations. Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 6(1), 7-10.

Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. E. (1991). Looking in classrooms. New York: Harper Collins.

Goodman, K. S. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. Journal of the Reading Specialist, 6, 126-135.

Goodman, K S. & Burke, C. (1973). Theoretically based studies of patterns of miscues in oral reading performance. Final Report to the U.S. Office of Education, Project No. 9-0375. Detroit, Mich.: Wayne State University.

Goodman, Y. & Burke, C. (1972). Reading miscue inventory manual: Procedure for diagnosis and evaluation. London, England: Collier and Macmillan.

Hannon, P. (1995). Literacy, home and school: Research and practice in teaching literacy with parents. Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Hannon, P., Jackson, A. and Weinberger, J. (1986). Parents and teachers strategies in hearing young children read. Research Papers in Education, 1(1), 6-25.

Hoffman, J. V. & Baker, C. M. (1981). Characterizing teacher feedback to student miscues during oral reading instruction. Reading Teacher, 34, 907-911.

Hoffman, J. V., & Clements, R. D. (1984). Reading miscues and teacher verbal feedback. Elementary School Journal, 84, 432-440.

Hoffman, J. V., O'Neal, S. F., Kastler, L. A., Clements, R. O., Segel, K. W., & Nash, M. F. (1984). Guided oral reading and miscue focused verbal feedback in second-grade classrooms. Reading Research Quarterly, 19, 367-384.

Hood, J. (1978). Is miscue analysis practical for teachers? The Reading Teacher, 32, 260-266.

Hood, J. (1982). The relationship of selected text variables to miscue scores of second graders. Journal of Reading Behavior, 14, 141-158.

Juel, C. (1991). Beginning reading. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Vol.2 (pp. 759-788). New York: Longman.

Mudre, L. H. & McCormick, S. (1989). Effects of meaning-focused cues on underachieving readers' context use, self-corrections, and literal comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 24(1), 89-113.

Pflaum, S. W., Pascarella, E. T., Boswick, M., & Auer, C. (1980). The influence of pupil behaviors and pupil status factors on teacher behaviors during oral reading lessons. Journal of Educational Research, 74, 99-105.

Purcell-Gates, V. & Dahl, K. L. (1991). Low-ses children's success and failure at early literacy learning in skills-based classrooms. Journal of Reading Behavior, 23(1), 1-34.

Roller, C. M. (1994). Teacher-student interaction during oral reading and rereading. Journal of Reading Behavior, 26(2), 191-209.

Share, D. L. (1990). Self-correction rates in oral reading: Indices of efficient reading or artifact of text difficulty? Educational Psychology, 10, 181-186.

Smith, F. (1988). Understanding reading (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stanovich, K. E. (1991). Word recognition: Changing perspective. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of reading research. Vol. 2 (pp. 418-452). New York: Longman.

Wixson, K. L. (1979). Miscue analysis: A critical review. Journal of Reading Behavior, 11, 163-175.

Appendix A

READER MISCUES

OK	-	**OK**	the miscue carried meaning that is compatible with the TEXT meaning. This is measured up through the end of the sentence containing the miscue.
P	-	**Predictable**	The miscue is a predictable word considering the preceding context (syntactically it fits, it is the right part of speech) but does not fit in with the following context nor carry meaning that is compatible with the TEXT meaning
N	-	**Nonsense**	the miscue is not a predictable word considering the preceding context
H	-	**Hesitation**	the reader hesitates for 3 or more seconds.
SSA	-	**Student Seeks Aid**	child looks to teacher for help or indicates uncertainty

READER RESPONSES TO MISCUES

SCS	-	**Student Corrects Spontaneously**	reader spontaneously (within 3 seconds) corrects the miscue without teacher assistance. Only the miscue or the one word preceding the miscue and the miscue are reread.
SCD	-	**Student Corrects Decoding**	reader corrects the miscue using a decoding strategy without listener assistance
SCM	-	**Student Corrects Meaning**	reader corrects the miscue using a meaning strategy without listener assistance (if a child rereads to correct it is SCM, if more than just the word before is reread)

ALL OF THE ABOVE ARE WHEN THE STUDENT INDICATES AWARENESS OF THE MISCUE WITHOUT ANY LISTENER INDICATION.

READER & LISTENER BEHAVIOR

C -	**Correction Signaled**	reader corrects the miscue after listener has signaled the need to correct. Listener may point, make sound or verbally indicate, but provides no coaching
NC -	**No Correction**	both reader and listener let the miscue go uncorrected

LISTENER BEHAVIORS

ACD -	**Aids Correction Decoding**	listener aids the reader through the correction of the miscue by coaching in the use of decoding procedures (when teacher has child point to each word it is marked ACD)
ACM -	**Aids Correction Meaning**	listener aids the reader through the correction of the the miscue by coaching in the use of meaning strategies (if listener tells child to reread it is marked ACM)
LC -	**Listener Corrects**	listener corrects the miscue without involving the reader, the miscue is just corrected, or after a hesitation the correct word is given

WHEN MARKED ALONE, ALL OF THESE ARE DONE WITHOUT GIVING THE READER A CHANCE TO SELF-CORRECT.

Appendix B

Miscue Grid

Story:_____

		MISCUE TYPE					READER RESP.			R&L		LISTENER RESP.		
Word Printed	Word Said	OK	P	N	H	SSA	SCS	SCD	SCM	C	NC	ACD	ACM	LC
1														
2														
3														
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														
21														
22														
23														
24														
25														

Appendix C

Table C.1

Table C.1
Story Information and Reader Performance

	HOME	CLASSROOM TEACHER	READING TEACHER	READING TUTOR(S)
Ashley	786 words read 34 miscues (4%) 66 WPM	683 words 16 miscues (2%) 72 WPM	1299 words 24 miscues (2%) 73 WPM	X
Nicole	206 words read 34 miscues (17%) 49 WPM	301 words 37 miscues (12%) 63 WPM	410 words 40 miscues (10%) 68 WPM	296 words 24 miscues (8%) 69 WPM
John	1066 words read 64 miscues (6%) 71 WPM	X	X	747 words 57 miscues (8%) 60 WPM 1252 words 144 miscues -12% 53 WPM
Johnny	1252 words read 85 miscues (7%) 70 WPM	759 words 60 miscues (8%) 61 WPM	X	1066 words 64 miscues (6%) 78 WPM

Appendix D

CATEGORIES OF SEGMENTS

Segments of uninterrupted reading

the reading time in seconds as measured between listener interruptions

Listener-interruptions of reading

miscue-related

LISTENER-INITIATED MISCUE COACHING -- all coaching interactions related to miscues *excluding* responses to the reader's self-corrections, hesitations to sound out words, and requests for help

story-related

LISTENER-INITIATED INTERACTIONS ABOUT STORY CONTENT -- listener comments and questions about story content which were not part of coaching interactions

FOLLOW-UP COMMENTS ON STORY CONTENT -- listener comments and questions about story content which were contiguous to coaching interactions

other

PRAISE -- listener commendations which were not part of coaching instructions

INSTRUCTION -- listener admonitions which were not part of coaching interactions

Other non-reading time

miscue-related

READER-INITIATED COACHING BY LISTENER -- all coaching interactions which followed hesitations of three seconds or more, reader-attempts to sound out words, and requests for help

story-related

READER-INITIATED INTERACTIONS ABOUT STORY CONTENT -- student comments and questions about story content that were not contiguous to coaching interactions

Table 1
Subjects, Readers and Their Respective Listeners

	HOME	CLASSROOM TEACHER	READING TEACHER	READING TUTOR(S)
Ashley gr. 2 7 years	Grand-mother	Ms. S.	Ms. G.	X
Nicole gr. 2 7 years	Mom	Ms. Sc.	Ms. R.	Ms. L.
John gr. 3 8 years	Mom	X	X	Ms. K. Ms. P.
Johnny gr. 1 7 years	Mom	Ms. L.	X	Ms. E.

Table 2
Purpose of the Reading session

	HOME	CLASSROOM TEACHER	READING TEACHER	READING TUTOR(S)
	Percent of session time spent reading (Mean = 70%, Median = 78%)			
Ashley	80%	55%	53%	X
Nicole	80%	58%	49%	78%
John	79%	X	X	84%, 81%
Johnny	69%	62%	X	87%
	Average length in words of reading uninterrupted by listener (Mean = 40, Median = 36)			
Ashley	66	49	41	X
Nicole	12	27	13	20
John	36	X	X	149, 40
Johnny	11	15	X	44
	Percent of listener-initiated interaction spent in meaning-related discussion (Mean = 38%, Median = 25%)			
Ashley	91%	93%	99%	X
Nicole	0%	36%	25%	25%
John	1%	X	X	62%, 24%
Johnny	6%	32%	X	6%

Table 3
Listener Encouragement of Independence Versus Dependence

	HOME	CLASSROOM TEACHER	READING TEACHER	READING TUTOR(S)
	Percent of hesitations/listener-use of wait-time (Mean = 21%, Median = 17%)			
Ashley	47%	56%	25%	X
Nicole	29%	17%	23%	17%
John	17%	X	X	7%, 6%
Johnny	4%	18%	X	6%
	Percent of listener-initiated corrections, excluding hesitations (Mean = 62%, Median = 63%)			
Ashley	11%	25%	17%	X
Nicole	94%	57%	77%	67%
John	74%	X	X	13%, 33%
Johnny	80%	78%	X	63%
	Percent of listener corrections using terminal feedback (Mean = 19%, Median = 7%)			
Ashley	7%	100%	0%	X
Nicole	58%	18%	10%	0%
John	14%	X	X	0%, 0%
Johnny	32%	5%	X	0%
	Percent of listener corrections that signal correction only (Mean = 29%, Median = 18%)			
Ashley	7%	0%	33%	X
Nicole	29%	18%	3%	58%
John	61%	X	X	17%, 9%
Johnny	15%	41%	X	91%

Table 4
Emphasis on Meaning Versus Print Cues in Miscue Feedback

	HOME	CLASSROOM TEACHER	READING TEACHER	READING TUTOR(S)
	Percent of listener corrections which draw attention to meaning cues (Mean = 37%, Median = 33%)			
Ashley	0%	0%	50%	X
Nicole	0%	57%	24%	20%
John	33%	X	X	100%, 95%
Johnny	13%	40%	X	50%
	Percent of OK miscues left uncorrected by listener (Mean = 65%, Median = 75%)			
Ashley	100%	75%	80%	X
Nicole	33%	88%	7%	38%
John	56%	X	X	89%, 84%
Johnny	20%	72%	X	84%
	Listener-initiated corrections before end of sentence			
Ashley	3 (33%)[1]	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	X
Nicole	12 (92%)	7 (29%)	14 (50%)	8 (25%)
John	24 (83%)	X	X	0(0%), 8 (25%)
Johnny	56 (91%)	18 (94%)	X	15 (87%)

[1] Number of times and percent of listener interruptions for miscue correction before end of sentence, excluding miscues on final words

Table 5
Reader Behavior

	HOME	CLASSROOM TEACHER	READING TEACHER	READING TUTOR(S)
	Number of reader-initiated interactions with a meaning focus			
Ashley	1	3	14	X
Nicole	0	0	0	1
John	0	X	X	1, 2
Johnny	0	0	X	0
	Percent of miscues for which reader sought assistance (Mean = 5%, Median = 3%)			
Ashley	32%	6%	4%	X
Nicole	9%	11%	5%	0%
John	3%	X	X	0%, 0%
Johnny	0%	0%	X	0%
	Percent of reader-initiated corrections with rereading of context surrounding the miscue (Mean = 7%, Median = 6%)			
Ashley	3%	6%	8%	X
Nicole	0%	10%	2%	0%
John	<1%	X	X	21%, 12%
Johnny	0%	0%	X	<1%
	Percent of high meaning-change miscues for which the reader initiated correction (Mean = 42%, Median = 38%)			
Ashley	38%	73%	61%	X
Nicole	5%	42%	27%	60%
John	31%	X	X	69%, 61%
Johnny	22%	18%	X	31